

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons which follow.

Claims 11, 16, 22, and 23 are amended presently. Claims 1-10, 15, 17, 18, and 25 are cancelled.

Applicants request that the Examiner enter these amendments and new claims because no new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in the specification, e.g., at Paragraphs [0028]-[0030].

With the foregoing amendments, claims 11-14, 16, 19-24, 26, and 27 are pending in this application.

Rejection under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

Responsive to the rejection of claims 11-14, 16, 19-27 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, Applicants have amended claims 11, 16, 22, and 23 and have cancelled claim 25. Applicants submit that presently-amended claims 11, 16, and 23, which had been particularly addressed by the Examiner as part of the current rejection, are now clear and definite. Applicants submit that claims 11, 16, and 23 and those claims depending from one of claims 11 and 23 are now in allowable form.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a)

Responsive to the rejection of claims 11-14, 16, and 21-25 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemic et al. (US 6,411,567) in view of Eckernas et al. (US 5,072,430), Applicants have amended claims 11, 16, 22, and 23 and have cancelled claim 25. As such, Applicants submit that claims 11-14, 16, and 21-24 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 11, as amended, recites in part:

... wherein the dielectric circuit overlay is patterned so as to follow and cover the electrical circuitry; ...

Claim 23, as amended, recites in part:

... the dielectric circuit overlay being patterned so as to follow and cover the electrical circuitry, ...

Applicants submit that the subject matter of claims 11 and 23 is neither taught or suggested by Niemiec et al., Eckernas et al., or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that Niemiec et al. does not teach all of the features of claim 11, claim 23, or the claims depending therefrom. In particular, Niemiec et al. describes:

A blister card 202 is formed such that pockets 204 extend from a planar card 206. A thin layer of chemically inert dielectric material 208 is adhered to the planar card 206. Traces 210 forming the severable conductor 108 are then printed onto the dielectric layer 208. A second dielectric layer 212 may then be overlayed onto the first dielectric layer 208 and the traces 210. A breakable closure 104 may then be adhered to the second dielectric layer 212.

(Column 5, lines 10-19)

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that “the disclosed dielectric overlay of Niemiec et al. exactly follows and covers the entire electronic circuitry as disclosed.” As can be seen from, e.g., Figs. 1 and 2 of Niemiec et al., the first and second dielectric layers 208, 212 are substantially coextensive with the blister card 202. Meanwhile, the network of severable conductors 108 is discretely positioned relative to the cells 102 of the blister card 202. As such, the basic patterning of either dielectric layer 208, 212 has no relationship with the comparatively complex layout of the severable conductors 108. Thus, Applicants submit that Niemiec et al. clearly fails to

teach or suggest the subject matter of amended claims 11 or 23.

The Examiner cites Eckernas et al. as support for rearranging the conductive protective layer to a position adjacent the first card. Eckernas et al., however, fails to overcome the shortcomings associated with Niemiec et al. In particular, Eckernas et al. fails to teach or suggest the patterning of the dielectric layer in the manner of claims 11 or 23.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 11 and 23, as well as those claims depending therefrom, are now in condition for allowance over Niemiec et al., Eckernas et al., or any other cited reference, taken alone or in combination.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 19-20 and 26 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claims 11 and 23 above, and further in view of either one of Williams-Hartman (US 7,188,728) and Wharton et al. (US 5,172,812), Applicants submit that claims 19 and 20 depend from allowable claim 11 and that claim 26 depends from allowable claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 19, 20, and 26 are now in condition for allowance.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 27 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Johnstone et al. (US 6,047,829), Applicants submit that claim 27 depends from now-allowable claim 23. As such, Applicants submit that claim 27 is now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the fees to 132512. If a fee is required for and extension of time under CFR § 1.136 that is not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey T. Knapp/

Jeffrey T. Knapp
Registration No.: 45,384
Agent for Applicants
Telephone No. (919) 334-3374

MeadWestvaco Corporation
Law Department
1021 Main Campus Drive
Raleigh, NC 27606
E-mail: jtk13@meadwestvaco.com
Telephone: (919) 334-3374
Facsimile: (919) 834-0844